

REMARKS

Claims 21-33 and 44-48 have been allowed.

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-20, 38-43 and 49-51 over the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The Office Action contended that our specification was not adequate to support the amendments to the claims based on a field timesharing display method. Applicants have addressed this issue by amending the independent Claims 1, 38 and 50 and canceling Claim 49..

The Office Action further rejected Claims 1-3, 6-7 and 38 as being anticipated by the *Kurogi et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,495,957) under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Additionally, Claims 4-5 and 42 were held to be unpatentable over the *Kurogi et al.* reference under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

The dependent Claims 8-20 and 39-43 were only rejected on the basis of a § 112 issue on the independent claims. Accordingly, it is believed that the subject matter of Claims 8-20 and 39-43 represents allowable subject matter since the § 112 issues have been adequately resolved.

The *Kurogi et al.* reference does not teach a plurality of pairs of display electrodes that are attempting to provide a discharge firing voltage that can be kept at a lower level in conserving energy consumption. See our specification on Page 19, second paragraph. Thus, the present invention is addressing the need for illuminance efficiency while providing outer protrusions and inner protrusions between our display electrodes. The display electrodes have dedicated pairs of electrodes, each formed as a scan electrode and a sustain electrode and positioned immediately adjacent to each other. Our panel driving circuit is thus enabled to both address and display an image by causing a discharge to be fired between the addressed plural

pairs of display electrodes that have been predetermined to provide the content of the image with each pair of display electrodes receiving a sustain pulse during the image display.

Kurogi et al. experiences a decline in brightness and raises the frequency of drive voltage to compensate, see Column 2, lines 49-57.

The *Kurogi et al.* reference in further distinction utilizes the ALiS or Alternate Lighting of Surfaces drive technology to interlace a composite display. Reference can be made to Figure 5 of the *Kurogi et al.* disclosure and to Column 7, Lines 11-18, where the image data for one scene is divided into an odd field f1 and an even field f2. In the odd field, the odd-numbered rows are used for display, and in the even field, the even-numbered rows are used for display, thereby providing an interlacing display. The application of the voltage waveforms, including the sustain pulses, can be seen in Figure 6 and are described on Column 7, Line 52, through Column 8, Line 10.

It is appreciated that the Examiner understands the difference in the ALiS display scheme, but cites MPEP § 2114 by contending that the method of operating does not differentiate an apparatus claim.

Applicants believe that their present specification and the teaching found in Figure 2 and Figure 3 more than adequately support the present claims. Reference can be made to Page 12, Line 3, through Page 14, Line 11.

Specifically, a comparison between our teaching in Figure 3 where the pair of display electrodes will receive a sustain pulse between each adjacent display pair when compared with the disclosure in the *Kurogi et al.* patent on Figure 6, wherein an odd field f1 and an even field f2 are separately addressed during the sustain period TS, thereby providing the interlacing display technique.

Claim 51 was rejected as not meeting the requirements of the first paragraph of § 112. The Office Action indicated that our specification did not teach voltage applied to each of the electrode pairs so as to provide a write discharge sequentially per electrode pair. It is believed that the above comments, and the reference to our disclosure in Figure 3 and our specification more than adequately support this claim language.

It is disclosed in our specification that “Via the scan driver 103 and the data driver 101, the panel driving part 1 . . . simultaneously applies a scan pulse to the X electrode 23 positioned at the top of the panel and a rewriting pulse to the address electrodes 28 corresponding to the cells 340 contributing to image display, thus generating a rewriting discharge and storing wall electric charge on the surface of the dielectric layer 24” (Page 12, Lines 14-20), and, furthermore, in the ensuing two paragraphs, “Next, via the scan driver 103 and the data driver 101, the panel driving part 1 simultaneously applies a scan pulse to the X electrode 23 positioned second from the top of the panel and a rewriting pulse to the address electrodes 28 corresponding to the cells 340 contributing to image display, thus generating a rewriting discharge and storing wall electric charge on the surface of the dielectric layer 24. By applying a continuous scan pulse, the panel driving part 1 continues, in the above manner, to *serially store*, on the surface of the dielectric layer 24, a wall electric charge corresponding to the cells 340 contributing to image display, and thus rewrite the latent image of each screen image of the PDP 2” (Page 12, Line 21, through Page 13, Line 8).

Applicant has also provided newly drafted dependent Claims 52 and 53, which are also supported by the above teachings and our Figures, and it is believed these claims more than adequately provide further definition of structure in the manner in which our panel driving circuit addresses and displays an image over that of the *Kurogi et al.* interlacing disclosure.

In view of the above amendments to the claims and comments, it is believed that the case is now in condition for allowance, and an early notification of the same is requested.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone interview will help further the prosecution of this case, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the listed telephone number.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to the Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on April 28, 2005.

By: Sharon Farnus


Sharon Farnus

Signature

Dated: April 28, 2005

Very truly yours,

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.



Joseph W. Price
Registration No. 25,124
1920 Main Street, Suite 1200
Irvine, California 92614-7230
Telephone: (949) 253-4920